

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Jose Ivar Pineda Campos v. Sergio Albarran, et al.

Pineda Campos · No. 25-cv-06920-JD · Decided November 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California granted Jose Ivar Pineda Campos’s motion for a preliminary injunction in his habeas action concerning immigration detention. The court enjoined the respondents from detaining him without a prior hearing before a neutral decisionmaker and from transferring him out of the district without prior court approval.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	James Donato
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	November 5, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-06920-JD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner, an asylum seeker detained by immigration authorities, sought habeas relief and a preliminary injunction requiring a pre-detention hearing before a neutral decisionmaker and preventing his transfer outside the district. The court previously granted a temporary restraining order and now granted the preliminary injunction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Preliminary-injunction standard: the movant must show a serious legal question or likelihood of success on the merits and make a sufficient showing on the remaining preliminary-injunction factors.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

- immigration detention
- injunctions
- removal proceedings
- civil procedure
- equitable relief

PRACTICE AREAS

- immigration
- civil procedure
- civil rights
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Pineda Campos was entitled to a preliminary injunction requiring a pre-detention hearing before a neutral decisionmaker.
2. Whether the court should enjoin respondents from transferring Pineda Campos outside the district without prior court approval.
3. Whether security was required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c).

HOLDINGS

1. Pineda Campos was entitled to a preliminary injunction because he raised a serious legal question and demonstrated a likelihood of success on whether he could be detained under the circumstances presented, while also making a sufficient showing on the remaining preliminary-injunction factors.
2. Respondents were enjoined from detaining Pineda Campos without a pre-detention hearing before a neutral decisionmaker.
3. Respondents were enjoined from transferring Pineda Campos outside the district without prior court approval.
4. Pineda Campos was not required to give security under Rule 65(c) because there was no realistic likelihood of harm to respondents from enjoining their conduct.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Respondents, and their officers, agents, employees, attorneys, and any person acting in concert with them, or at their behest, and who has knowledge of this injunction, are enjoined from detaining petitioner Jose Ivar Pineda Campos without a pre-detention hearing before a neutral decisionmaker.” (at 2)

“Respondents, and their officers, agents, employees, attorneys, and any person acting in concert with them, or at their behest, and who has knowledge of this injunction, are enjoined from transferring petitioner Jose Ivar Pineda Campos out of the District without the Court’s prior approval.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jose Ivar Pineda Campos, an asylum seeker from Nicaragua, was detained by immigration authorities. He challenged detention under the circumstances presented and sought a hearing before a neutral decisionmaker before detention, as well as protection against transfer outside the district. The court found the salient facts undisputed and noted that the government had not shown any material change since the TRO.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Pineda Campos filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus and an application for a temporary restraining order seeking release from detention. The duty judge granted the TRO. After considering the record and the parties' arguments, the district court granted a preliminary injunction and directed the parties to propose a briefing schedule for the habeas petition.

DISPOSITION

CASES CITED

- Am. Fed'n of Gov't Emps., AFL-CIO v. Trump, No. 25-CV-03070-JD, 2025 WL 1755442, at *8 (N.D. Cal. June 24, 2025)
- Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127, 1131 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Caicedo Hinestroza et al. v. Kaiser et al., 25-cv-07559-JD, Dkt. No. 8 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025)
- Jorgensen v. Cassiday, 320 F.3d 906, 919-20 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Barahona-Gomez v. Reno, 167 F.3d 1228, 1237 (9th Cir. 1999)

OPINION

1 2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 4 5
JOSE IVAR PINEDA CAMPOS, Case No. 25-cv-06920-JD 6 Plaintiff, ORDER RE
PRELIMINARY 7 v. INJUNCTION 8 SERGIO ALBARRAN, et al., Defendants. 9 10 Petitioner
Jose Ivar Pineda Campos, an asylum seeker from Nicaragua, filed a writ of 11 habeas corpus
against respondents Sergio Albarran¹, Field Office Director of the San Francisco 12 Immigration
and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Office; Todd Lyons, Acting Director of ICE; Kristi 13 Noem,
Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security; and Pam Bondi, U.S. Attorney 14
General, all named in their official capacities.

See Dkt. No. 1. Pineda Campos filed an application 15 for a temporary restraining order for
release from detention, Dkt. No. 2, which the duty judge 16 granted, Dkt. No. 4. He asks for a
preliminary injunction barring detention by respondents 17 without a prior hearing before a neutral
decisionmaker. See Dkt. No. 15.

The parties' familiarity 18 with the record is assumed and an injunction is granted. 19 The salient
facts are undisputed, and the government has not indicated that any material 20 facts have changed
since the TRO was granted. Pineda Campos has raised a serious legal 21 question, and
demonstrated a likelihood of success, with respect to the merits of whether he may 22 be detained
in the circumstances presented here, and has also made a sufficient showing on the 23 other factors
that the Court considers when granting a preliminary injunction.

See Am. Fed'n of 24 Gov't Emps., AFL-CIO v. Trump, No. 25-CV-03070-JD, 2025 WL 1755442,
at *8 (N.D. Cal. 25 June 24, 2025) (citing Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127,
1131 (9th Cir. 26 2011)); Dkt. No. 4 at 12-19.

The government's contentions to the contrary have been addressed 27 1 and disallowed by the
Court in cases substantively identical to this one. See Caicedo Hinestroza 2 et al. v. Kaiser et al.,
25-cv-07559-JD, Dkt. No. 8 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2025). That discussion and 3 reasoning are
incorporated here.

The government has not presented a good reason to reach a 4 || different conclusion at this time. 5
Consequently, a preliminary injunction is granted on the ensuing terms. If circumstances 6 ||
change materially, the government may request a modification of the injunction. 7 (1)
Respondents, and their officers, agents, employees, attorneys, and any person acting in 8 concert
with them, or at their behest, and who has knowledge of this injunction, are enjoined from 9
detaining petitioner Jose Ivar Pineda Campos without a pre-detention hearing before a neutral 10 ||
decisionmaker.

11 (2) Respondents, and their officers, agents, employees, attorneys, and any person acting in 12
concert with them, or at their behest, and who has knowledge of this injunction, are enjoined from
5 13 || transferring petitioner Jose Ivar Pineda Campos out of the District without the Court's prior
14 approval. 15 There is no realistic likelihood of harm to respondents from enjoining their
conduct, and so 16 || Pineda Campos need not give security under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
65(c).

See 3 17 Jorgensen v. Cassiday, 320 F.3d 906, 919-20 (9th Cir. 2003); Barahona-Gomez v. Reno,
18 167 F.3d 1228, 1237 (9th Cir. 1999). 19 The parties are directed to jointly propose by
November 28, 2025, a briefing schedule on 20 || the petition for a writ of habeas corpus. 21 IT IS
SO ORDERED. 22 Dated: November 5, 2025 23 24 25 JAMES/#!/ONATO United States District
Judge 26 27 28